*Colubraria* group (following the sense of Helbling, 1779) or for *Fusinus* species (following that of Bruguière, 1789) would be potentially confusing. The suppression proposed by Beu, Marshall & Ponder conserves *Colubraria* and also protects the widely used *Fusinus* Rafinesque, 1815 from its senior synonym *Fusus* Bruguière, 1789. Adoption of this course seems to me to be the best solution of this case.

## Additional reference

**Oliverio, M. & Tringali, L.** 1991. *Fusus intertextus* and (?)*Fusus* sp. in the Mediterranean Sea (Neogastropoda; Buccinidae; Pisaniinae). *Notiziario Centro Italiano Studi Malacologici*, **13–14**: 38–40.

## Comment on the proposed precedence of *Taningia danae* Joubin, 1931 (Mollusca, Cephalopoda) over *T. persica* (Naef, 1923)

(Case 2845; see BZN 49: 261–263)

Malcolm R. Clarke
*Ridge Court, Court Road, Newton Ferrers, Plymouth PL8 1DD, Devon, U.K.*

The application by Vecchione & Roper is a sensible way out of a problem, and I support all their proposals.

## Comment on the proposed attribution of the specific name of *Ceratites nodosus* (Mollusca, Ammonoidea) to Schlotheim, 1813, with the designation of a lectotype

(Case 2732; see BZN **48**: 31–35, 246; **49**: 145–149, 290; **50**: 54–56)

N.J. Silberling
*U.S. Geological Survey, MS-919, Box 25046, Federal Center, Denver, Colorado 80225, U.S.A.*

In supporting Urlichs's application regarding *Ceratites nodosus*, Hahn (BZN **48**: 246) states that acceptance of the proposals will conserve the name 'as used today'. In further support, Tichy (BZN **49**: 290) says that acceptance will 'conserve the established usage of the name *nodosus*'. Their comments create the impression that Urlichs's proposal will stabilize a taxonomic usage that has been established for a long time, but this view cannot be defended. The first major work dealing with *Ceratites nodosus* was Philippi (1901). In this the species is cited as '*Ceratites nodosus* (Brug.) Schloth.'. Bruguière's description of the taxon is in Philippi's synonymy and the illustration by Scheuchzer (1718) is given as the first published of the species. It is the specimen on which this drawing was based which, contrary to Urlichs's proposal, was designated as the lectotype for *Ceratites nodosus* (Bruguière) by Rieber & Tozer (1986). Bruguière is also cited as the author of the species in the comprehensive works which provide a synonymy of *C. nodosus* (Riedel, 1916; Spath, 1934; Penndorf, 1951; Wenger, 1957). The taxonomic usage defended by Hahn as being currently used was only initiated by Urlichs and Mundlos in 1987, hardly long enough ago to have originated a history of 'established usage' as referred to by Tichy. The complaint by Tichy that acceptance of Tozer's proposal (BZN **49**: 148) will necessitate transfer of the name *Ceratites (Ceratites) nodosus* to *Ceratites (Doloceratites) robustus* Riedel, 1916 is not germane. This is not an objective necessity but only a consequence of accepting the subjective synonymy proposed by Urlichs & Mundlos (1987).

## Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific names of *Gebia major capensis* Krauss, 1843 and *G. africana* Ortmann, 1894 (currently *Upogebia capensis* and *U. africana*; Crustacea, Decapoda) by the designation of a replacement neotype for *U. capensis*

(Case 2827; BZN **49**: 187–190)

(1) C.L. Griffiths

*Marine Biology Research Institute, Zoology Department, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch 7700, South Africa*

The species currently known by the names *Upogebia capensis* (Krauss, 1843) and *U. africana* (Ortmann, 1894) are amongst the better-known elements of the South African marine fauna and are extensively used by fishermen for bait. The names are thus well known not only in the specialist literature but also in general guide books and, indeed, in the laws governing seashore exploitation. It would therefore be very confusing if these names were unnecessarily changed. I therefore support the proposed replacement of the neotype for *U. capensis*, thus conserving the present usages.

(2) W. Emmerson

*Department of Zoology, University of Transkei, Private Bag XI UNITRA, Umtata, Transkei, Southern Africa*

I have recently read the application by Ngoc-Ho & Poore to conserve the specific names of *Upogebia capensis* (Krauss, 1843) and *U. africana* (Ortmann, 1894). Although I was aware of Sakai's (1982) name changes these do not appear to have been followed except in a catalogue by Holthuis (1991) who noted the unfortunate consequences. Certainly everyone here in South Africa still maintains the established usages. To avoid confusion I support the application and the proposed replacement neotype.

*Editorial note.* The comments below are from members of the Nomenclature Committee of The Crustacean Society.

(3) K. Baba

*Kumamoto University Faculty of Education, 2–40–1 Kurokami, Kumamoto, 860 Japan*

As has been explained by Ngoc-Ho & Poore in their application, Sakai's (1982) selection of the neotype for *Upogebia capensis* from material assigned to *U. africana* has caused a problem. The authors believe that *capensis* and *africana* are distinct species, separated from each other not only morphologically but also ecologically